

**IN-DEPTH DIVISION REVIEW**  
**FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS DIVISION**  
**Program Statement**

Draft

March 1986

**IN-DEPTH DIVISION REVIEW**  
**FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS DIVISION**

**Program Statement**

**Text**

- I Pre-Division 1972-1983
- II Creation of the Fellowships and Awards Division (FAD) (1983- )
- III The Future
- IV The Continuation of FAD's Strategic Planning
- V Staffing

**Tables**

- 1. Recommendations of the Training Policy Study and actions to implement them.
- 2. Existing Training Mechanisms fitted to New Program Activities.

**Annexes** (Blue Section)

- 1. President's Memorandum: August 18, 1981
- 2. Centre Support for HRD/Training as a distinct Activity
- 3. FAD Staff Projections
- 4. Categories of HRD/Training Support Since the Inception of IDRC
- 5. FAD Budget Projections to FY 89/90
- 6. Analysis of Distribution FAD Funds FY 84/85 (3 Tables)
- 7. Old Programs (FY 84/85) converted to New Programs
- 8. FADMIS Tables
- 9. List of FAD Projects

March 1986

## In-depth Division Review

### Program Statement

### Fellowships and Awards Division

#### I Pre-Division (1972-1983)

The Fellowship and Awards Division (FAD) began operations on October 1, 1983. Prior to the creation of this Division, **Human Resource Development (HRD)** activities, often loosely referred to as **training** had been covered under various mechanisms in other areas of the Centre: an ancillary Human Resources unit of the Social Sciences Division (1973-1979), a unit within the Executive Office supervised by the Senior Vice-President (1979-1980); a Fellowships Program within the office of the Secretary and General Counsel (1980-1983).

From its inception the Centre realized the close relationship between research and training. Although the first President of IDRC, W.D. Hopper, wrote in 1973 "The Centre has, no programs of scholarships or other formal training assistance at any educational level", several divisions had taken steps to deal with the perceived lack of trained researchers in the developing world or the lack of opportunities to train researchers for the future. Thus AFNS and ISD built training opportunities into many of their projects, ISD funded training projects per se and SSD made its concern for training explicit in its original designation as the **Social Sciences and Human Resources Division**.

By 1979 Dr. Hopper's assessment of the Centre's role in training was no longer valid. The **Human Resources Unit** which had spun off from the Social Sciences Division became on April 1, 1980 had become the **Fellowship Program** within the Office of the Secretary and General Counsel. In addition to this explicit allocation of Centre resources to training, the Program Divisions (with the exception of HSD) continued to support in-project training or training projects. The extent of the Centre's support for training and the mechanisms used remained the subject of debate which culminated in the **Training Policy Study (TPS)** prepared by OPE in February 1981.

The TPS reviewed the history, modalities, and extent of Centre supported training. It concluded that because the Program Divisions were directing an increasing amount of support to countries with weak research infrastructure and towards provincial institutions and showing greater interest in training support in new or neglected research areas, support for training would increase. Because it recognized support would still come from the research project mechanism and from specific training projects, TPS did not believe a rigid training policy should apply Centre wide.

TPS chose to set out guidelines and recommendations. These were given the force of policy when they were presented to Centre Officers in a memo from the President on August 18, 1981 (see Annex 1).

Little changed for the Program Divisions which could continue their established support mechanisms for training. The Fellowship Program took the TPS and the guidelines set out in the President's memorandum as an implicit mandate to oversee the share of the Centre's resources specifically dedicated to training.

It is easier to trace the evolution of the Centre's training activities after TPS was published if we show the manner in which its recommendations were implemented. A paraphrase of the TPS recommendations and the actions to implement them have been set out in TABLE 1.

## **II Creation of the Fellowships and Awards Division (1983- )**

FAD came into being at the mid point of FY 83-84. For the balance of that year it worked within the program of activities it had developed as the Fellowships Program of the Office of Secretary and General Counsel. As we saw above this set of activities reflected both the evolution of the training activity through various incarnations in the Centre and the recommendations of TPS.

In preparing its first Program of Work and Budget as a Division for FY 84-85 FAD had an opportunity to adjust its program organization and resource distribution to reflect the greater commitment the Centre was prepared to give to training as a distinct activity. This marked the **first stage of the new Division's strategic planning.**

The two broad program areas were maintained. i.e. **Programs for Developing Countries** and **Programs for Canadians.** **Special Programs,** was also continued. Most of the activities subsumed under these programs were retained unchanged because of long term commitments which had to be carried over.

The transformation of some programs indicated the new Division's strategies for its training activities. The long standing grant for the International Foundation for Science was to be funded under a new activity entitled **Third Party Training.** Two new activities - **Institutional Development** and **New Initiatives** - echoed the recommendations of TPS which called for efforts to strengthen the training capacity of LDC institutions and urged experimental approaches to research-related training.

In its first PWB, FAD also formalized its commitments to the **Selective Trainer/Trainee** approach to capacity building. This strategy ensures that both the trainee institutions (ie those institutions which send participants to a training course) and the trainer institution (ie the institution providing the training facilities and programs) benefit from the Centre supported training projects. It was understood by FAD that this mechanism represented an ideal training relationship that might be realized to different degrees within the developing world. Experience in Asia had shown that a number of institutions could benefit from this exchange. The state of institutional development in Africa required a greater degree of flexibility in seeking mechanisms for institutional development.

**TABLE I** Recommendations of the Training Policy Study.

And actions taken to implement them.

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Implementation</u>
<p>A Training should continue to be closely related to the Centre's program priorities. If the project mechanism is the primary vehicle for Centre supported training, then training activities should remain within the Centre's program areas. The Fellowship Program should pursue its intentions to place emphasis on awards which complement program priorities of the Centre even in the case of individual awards not related to projects.</p>	<p>This recommendation allowed for two approaches to Centre training: 1. The status quo was maintained for the Program Divisions: AFNS could continue its practise of providing training within the research projects it supported and 2. pointed reference was made to the service function of the Fellowships Program.</p> <p>The service functions of the Fellowships Program were embodied in its project for individual awards which provided Project Related Awards in support of the current project work of the Programs Divisions and Program Related Awards in support of their longer range program objectives.</p>
<p>A small portion of funds for Fellowship Program activities should be earmarked for awards to exceptional individuals with no restrictions on the field of study.</p>	<p>Support for exceptional individuals was provided through programs for Research Fellows (This genre of support had several changes of title over the years).</p>
<p>In response to LDC research training needs when better and more complete information on the research training needs, of individual countries becomes available, the Centre should be prepared to move outside the program areas through specific training activities in new and pioneering fields.</p>	<p>Activities outside of established program areas were provided for through the Pearson Fellowship Program although here too, while a somewhat unique program based on the Centre's historical associations, the spirit of the Program Divisions' mandates was kept in mind when selecting Fellows and arranging appropriate programs. Further advantage was taken of this invitation to try experiments in training after the formation of FAD.</p>
<p>B Whenever possible, in-project training should be designed and scheduled to enable trainees to become directly involved in at least a part of the project or in a subsequent phase. Similarly, Pre-project Awards should be short enough (usually less than 12 months) for the trainees to become involved in the project. Post-project Awards should be offered only to individuals who have been involved in Centre projects and are able to contribute to the development of the research community after the termination of the award.</p>	<p>The Program Divisions (with the exception of HSD) continued to provide in-project training opportunities.</p> <p>This recommendation was already in effect and remained the policy governing the Project Related Awards provided by the Fellowship Program.</p>

**TABLE I** Recommendations of the Training Policy Study.

And actions taken to implement them.

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Implementation</u>
<p>C The Centre should take a longer-term perspective and finance specific training projects in areas of critical shortage within the Centre's program areas. In supporting such projects, emphasis should be given to the utilization and strengthening or development of a training capability in the Third World. No specific training project which provides individual grants should be approved which duplicates the awards provided through the Fellowship Program unless some local institutional capability or expertise is being utilized or developed.</p>	<p>Group Training projects were instituted to provide the specific training called for. The emphasis on the strengthening and development of training capability within Third World institutions was heeded by placing, whenever possible, these training projects in institutions in developing countries. Later this requirement was formalized in the Selective Trainer/Trainee Scheme.</p>
<p>D Future training support should be focused more on the LLDCs. The implementation of this implies either a similar shift in the project pattern, or an increase in the training component of budgets in LLDC projects, or a greater number of specific training projects being financed in the LLDCs.</p>	<p>This recommendation urged, not a change in methods and mechanisms for training, so much as increased sensitivity to the need to use every opportunity to support the LLDCs. The extent to which the distribution of Centre support for training accords with these recommendation needs to be examined.</p>
<p>E Several closely interlocking recommendations are best considered in a group.</p>	<p>In one form or another most of these recommendations were incorporated into either the criteria for individual awards or program thrusts of the Fellowship Program.</p>
<p>A greater portion of funds should be allocated to more formal training in the LLDCs, where the shortfall in the number of formally-trained scientists appears to be the greatest; whilst in the more advanced LDCs, emphasis should be given to training activities geared to building up specific research skills.</p>	<p>The extent to which the recommendations touch on the share of training resources allocated to the LLDC as compared to the more advanced developing country needs to be explored. The move to provide formal training (graduate degree training) for the LLDCs and to deemphasize this level of support for the more advanced countries became policy.</p>
<p>Less support be given to longer-term formal degree training, and more specifically:</p>	
<p>(i) support for PhD training be given only in exceptional circumstances;</p>	<p>The support for doctoral training was reduced and the Masters became the preferred formal qualification.</p>
<p>(ii) whenever post graduate training is considered, a Masters program should be given preference, with, if training takes place abroad, a combination of home-based research and training in advanced institutions abroad;</p>	

**TABLE I** Recommendations of the Training Policy Study.

And actions taken to implement them.

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Implementation</u>
E (Continued)	E (Continued)
(iii) the Centre should not normally support under-graduate diploma and Bachelors degree training since facilities for these are generally available in local institutions.	The Centre did not provide support for first degrees.*
The Centre should encourage more short-term and informal training courses designed to build up skills in a particular discipline, and more specifically:	
(i) the use of <b>short courses and specially designed workshops</b> should be encouraged to enhance skills in new subject areas and in new technologies. The Centre must be prepared to support, help design and monitor such activities;	The short course or specially designed training workshops have been provided through the <b>Group Training</b> mechanism. Program Divisions have also supported this type of training.
(ii) since there is evidence to suggest that some <b>study tours</b> have questionable training value and are expensive and difficult to plan and administer, they should be supported with caution. Multi-country, short duration tours for junior scientists should be discontinued;	Open ended study tours never were a marked feature of Centre support for training and have not become so.
(iii) the Centre should explore whether the preparation and dissemination of research progress reports, questionnaires and other research materials of ongoing research projects would be useful rather than only circulating the final results;	No systematic attempt has been made to ensure that material generated by Centre supported research projects have found their way into subject-related Centre supported training initiatives.
(iv) since many research skills can be derived through <b>supervised on-the-job training</b> , this approach should be encouraged with more care given to specifying the advisory role of supervisors; and	Centre training programs - apart from the Pearson Fellowship - have not emphasized on the job training. However, the short term courses and workshops often incorporate a hands on experience and exposure to the working environment of the issue under discussion. When applicable funds have been provided to take Centre supported trainees enrolled in universities outside of their home country back to the field for data collection and consultations. Travel support has been given to thesis supervisors to enable them to provide an appropriate level of supervision for their students when in the field.

\* An exception was made for 3-P-84-0051 Farming Systems Bhutan a training project undertaken in conjunction with AFNS.

**TABLE I** Recommendations of the Training Policy Study.

And actions taken to implement them.

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Implementation</u>
E (Continued)	
(v) since many Centre staff and consultants visit projects frequently, more attention should be given to their potential function as trainers.	It is difficult to judge the extent to which Centre staff or consultants have played a liaison role between the research projects supported by their programs and related training.
F (a) Since many project teams are deficient in research support skills, the Centre should entertain more requests for training in data collection and analysis, laboratory techniques, etc., which tend to improve the skills of more junior researchers;	This recommendation was addressed through the Group Training activity implemented by the Fellowship Program. This particular recommendation focused not so much on the training mechanism as on the target group of trainees. Up grading the skills of researchers became the primary focus of the Group Training activity.
(b) Since research management skills appear to be weak in many institutions, the Centre should provide more support for upgrading these skills, primarily for middle-level and senior researchers. The Centre should experiment with short courses to teach research management in selected LDC institutions.	The provision of training for research management skills has been a hotly debated issue among the Centre's Program Divisions: a fact which has mitigated against any concerted effort in this area.
(c) The Centre should explore the feasibility of strengthening the capability of middle and low level personnel involved in program operations and delivery of services as proposed by the Health Sciences Division.	A series of Group Training projects has been used to train a wide range of health professional whose work is research related either as researchers or as research users.
Since these are general skill deficiencies, they could best be handled through workshop training activities to reach a larger group, possibly under the auspices of the Fellowship Program. Where the skills are strongly discipline-oriented, the activities should be organized by the appropriate Program Division.	



**TABLE I** Recommendations of the Training Policy Study.

And actions taken to implement them.

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Implementation</u>
<p>G The Centre should give priority to placing trainees in training institutions in their own country or elsewhere in the Third World. Although training in a more industrialized country may be more appropriate for senior researchers or in situations where no other option exists, for reasons of relevance of training, long-term developmental impact and possibly cost, priority should be given to using training facilities in the Third World. This requires a longer-term perspective to be taken as we cannot expect a major shift in the short-term. In some cases, it would involve a commitment to build up training capabilities of LDC institutions to provide adequate facilities for Third World trainees.</p>	<p>These recommendations became policy for the Fellowship Program. Appropriate training was sought according to the following sequence in order of preference; an LDC institution (either in the award holder's own country, region or another LDC; Canada; and, the rest of the world.</p>
<p>Where no appropriate local or other LDC facilities exist, trainees should be placed in compatible research environments, with home-based field research and provision made for monitoring visits by supervisors built into the training program. The selection of supervisors should be based on their familiarity with the problems of LDCs and experience in fields of research appropriate to the needs of trainees. The supervisor should have a complete briefing on the trainee's involvement in research projects in his home institution and the relevance of his current training to these research activities.</p>	<p>The Selective Trainer/Trainee approach was intended to strengthen LDC institutions.</p> <p>Whenever possible award holders have been given the resources to conduct their research at home and to be visited by their supervisors.</p>
<p>Appropriate Canadian institutions should be identified for locating trainees and the Canadian option be explored before sending trainees to other industrialized countries.</p>	<p>When appropriate institutions or training cannot be found in an LDC, Canadian institutions are given preference.</p>
<p>H With a view to improving the data base for future analysis, project documentation should, provide a more explicit rationale for training activities, their design, budget and number to be trained, location and other pertinent data. This would enable the Centre to better manage the different training initiatives that have been financed and to evaluate the purposes and cost effectiveness of the various training mechanisms.</p>	<p>The Centre's project stationery was revised to include training data. The Fellowships and Awards Division Management Information System FADMIS is discussed below (see Annex 8).</p>

**TABLE I Recommendations of the Training Policy Study.**

**And actions taken to implement them.**

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Implementation</u>
<p>I A permanent but ad hoc Training Advisory Committee should be set up with specific responsibilities for:</p> <p>(a) improving the collection of data on training activities;</p> <p>(b) exchanging information on divisional training initiatives and functioning as an inter-divisional pool of training expertise;</p> <p>(c) monitoring the evaluation of training initiatives; and</p> <p>(d) reviewing training policies and practices as they evolve within the Centre.</p> <p>It is expected that the staff of the Education Program in the Social Sciences Division and those in the Regional Offices will be closely associated in these follow-up activities.</p>	<p>The Ad hoc Training Advisory Committee was established and continues to exist in spirit. Since the creation of FAD in October 1983 with oversight of Centre training programs devolving on the Board of Governors through its approval of the Division's Program of Work and Budget routine reference to the Committee has discontinued.</p>

Another important adjustment to Divisional status was FAD's use of COOP funds. Until FY 83-84 FAD had funded the **Young Canadian Researchers (YCR)** from the Centre's allocation to the Fellowships Program. Beginning in FY 84-85 COOP funds were available to FAD to support the YCR and **Medical Exchange Programs**.

In its second year of operation FAD had had time to rethink the **rationale** for the list of programs and criteria it had transferred and transformed from its days as the Fellowship Program. In FY 84-85, budget cuts forced FAD to make a spot evaluation of its program priorities. Faced with a choice of spreading reduced funds over all existing program activities or maintaining the funding levels of some activities while dropping others entirely, FAD opted for the latter. The principal change was the reduction of support for the **Research Fellows** activity in FY 84-85 and its suspension in FY 85-86. FAD felt that available resources were better invested in younger researchers who required training to enter or remain in research. Support for older more experienced researchers, while desirable if resources were available, was less defensible when resources were scarce.

The restructuring of priorities and the introduction of new program headings marked FAD's **second stage of strategic planning**. The importance of strategic planning became apparent when the Division had to take into account a number of issues which might influence its decision making process.

FAD's decisions must balance its **service function** and **professional function**. When seeking the balance FAD is often faced with a dilemma: it must make choices, not only for the allocation of its own resources but also for the direction of the training initiatives of the other Divisions. This dilemma does not result in a retreat to the status quo. Rather it is the tension at the heart of the developmental process that characterizes efforts to nurture HRD. It should not force FAD and the other Divisions to take separate routes to training but should encourage co-operation to find the best fit of the Centre's resources for training to the problem of encouraging and sustaining good research.

Under the Division's **service function** FAD must take into account a number of variables contained in requests for its support.

- . Requests may be argued for in terms of the need to assist project development, program development and for support to encourage or sustain institutions considered key research and training nodes within a region.

- . Requests may appeal to the importance of the training needs of one unit over another within a single division.
- . Units or divisions may argue for exceptions to FAD policy that discourages support for doctoral degrees or urge training in American or European institutions rather than Canadian schools.
- . Arguments will be made on the merits of providing greater support for the LLDC's of Africa as opposed to support for the more developed institutions of Asia.
- . Another consideration is the balance that must be struck between FAD's financial and administration support for individual awards and its support for training projects.

The reconsideration of factors which influence FAD's decisions to support training requests has taken place against the background of the wider debate within the Centre which reexamines its mission and objectives. As a service division FAD's strategy must reflect and accommodate the shifting priorities and approaches originating in the Program Divisions.

FAD must also complement its basic service function with a **professional function** which may be expressed in a number of ways, for example:

- . advising on the design of training courses;
- . participating in the planning and design of curriculum;
- . advising on teaching methods and material preparations appropriate for a particular subject or group of participants;
- . influencing the integration of training and research within institutions identified for Centre support;
- . monitoring innovative approaches to training;
- . matching training resources (in the LDC's and Canada) to training needs; and
- . supporting research on training.

These resource allocation and training variables have been allowed for through FAD's policy of decentralization. This policy was put into place by the old Fellowship Program which as early as 1981 placed a senior program officer in ASRO. All subsequent additional person years have been assigned to the Centre's regional offices. This policy of decentralization not only spreads the administrative burden of the Division but also ensures that FAD is particularly responsive to the research and training issues within a sector and within a region and able to provide professional guidance not only on the immediate training requirements of Centre-supported activities but on more comprehensive issues of HRD within their regions.

FAD takes both **retrospective** and **prospective** views of its activities within the regions.

In ASRO, where FAD activities are well established, the senior program officer has embarked on a series of evaluations to question, in particular, the efficacy of the Selective Trainer/Trainee approach. (See the document : FAD Training in the Asia and Pacific Region, 1982-84 : an evaluation study 3-A-84-4257). A series of meetings of former FAD award holders is also underway (3-A-85-4154). In addition to these studies, designed and supervised by staff members, FAD has joined with the Rockefeller Foundation, the Agricultural Development Council, and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund to review the development of Human Capital in the Social Sciences in Asia over the past thirty years (3-A-83-4260).

The recently appointed Senior Program Officer for LARO is preparing for her work in the region by overseeing a comprehensive study to analyze in a group of selected countries in Latin America and the Caribbean the availability of human resources for research and the main factors which influence the training and use of these resources (3-A-85-4109). A similar study has been organized by the Senior Program Officer in EARO who has focussed on the availability of graduate training within the region (3-A-84-4096).

At the end of FY 84/85, its first year as a Division, FAD analyzed the distribution of its funds among the Regional Offices, Program Divisions and their Program Units. These tables are found in Annex 6. With data from only the first year of FAD's operation, limited conclusions are possible. The skewing of FAD resources towards ASRO, AFNS and the Fisheries Program may be explained by the long standing representation of FAD in the region, the concentration of well established training infrastructure etc. Future annual analysis will enable FAD to determine the extent to which its patterns of support respond to and shape the set of competing demands discussed above.

To analyze the way FAD has distributed its individual awards in terms of the Centre's Program Divisions, and Program Units, and by the country of origin of the awardee, the nature, level and location of training, FAD has established the **Fellowships and Awards Management Information System (FADMIS)**. Tables based on this database are still under development but samples and explanatory notes are given in Annex 8.

In its PWB for 1986/87 FAD moves to a **third stage of its strategic planning** by serving notice of significant changes to be made in FY 1987-88.

### III The Future

#### Training Programs vs Training Mechanisms

The Division has become increasingly conscious of the fact that the descriptive headings of its fields of activity are a mix of programs (for example, Institutional Development, Pearson Fellowships, Program Related Awards) and mechanisms (for example, Third Party, Group Training). The division believes that changes must be made to distinguish between **training programs** and **training mechanisms** which will provide FAD with a framework for:

- a) aligning the Division's activity to changing Centre priorities; and
- b) the redistribution of FAD resources between the regional offices, other divisions and programs.

FAD proposes to request resources under five **program** headings: **Project Development** (18%), **Program Development** (41%), **Institutional Development** (20%), **Specialized Training** (10%) and **Training for Careers, Canada** (5%). FAD will maintain a category for **Energy** training for 1986/87 after which the Centre's special fund for Energy will be exhausted.

The change anticipates a shift in the allocation of training resources as countries progress to higher levels of development. FAD expects a progression from **Project Development** (an immediate Centre need and, therefore, a service FAD must provide) through **Program Development** (which is an intermediate step to switch from project-by-project funding to support for more autonomous programs of research and training) through to the ideal of **Institutional Development** (the stage when the Centre will deal with autonomous research and training institutions). The percentages given of FAD resources allocated to each category indicate the relative importance FAD has given to these activities under its current funding mechanisms. A table showing the notional distribution of the "old" categories over the "new" programs using data from FY 84/85 is given in Annex 7.

The category **Specialized Training** will take account of the "odd" training activities that may be required by a project, program or institution to satisfy a short-term training need; for example, the Pearson Fellowship training in research management, microcomputer applications, or specialized research methods.

The program **Training for Careers in Development, Canada** reflects more accurately the intent of the training activities funded from the Centre's Cooperative Programs Division's funds.

The established **training mechanisms** will be retained. The **group training** mechanism, for example, can be used to provide training in support of a project, program or institution or to provide specialized training. Similarly a **third party** can be used to provide a training program under any one of these program activities. The planned third party arrangement for the Pearson Fellowship and the proposed arrangement for the NSERC grants (both of these propositions will be presented to the board in March 1986) would fall within the Specialized Training Activity.

The **Selective Trainer/Trainee** approach and all other criteria such as the emphasis on formal training at the Masters level and the sequence of priorities for the location of training will remain unchanged.

FAD believes that this proposed rearrangement will reinforce its overall commitment to building the capacity of LDC institutions to meet their own research and training needs. There are several other features; namely:

- . **It will provide a logical framework for an evaluation of past and future training activities.**

In arranging the new programs in order of priority FAD makes a general statement of objectives because a progression from project support to institutional support is a goal for both the research and training support provided by the Centre. Using this new framework to examine the type and level of training provided to a Region, a Program Division or a Program Unit will indicate the strength or weakness of both the human and institutional resources available to address development problems within a particular region or field of research.

This framework will enable us to answer such questions as:

- . Has the distribution of training resources remained constant or is there a perceptible move away from project development towards institutional development?
- . What does the distribution of training resources within certain fields of research or regions indicate about the level of development in each of these?

**TABLE II Existing Training Mechanisms Fitted to New Program Activities.**

<u>Program</u>	<u>Mechanisms</u>
<b><u>A Project Development</u></b>	
Support under this program will be reserved for "weaker" sectors that is for fields where the research infrastructure, appropriate human resources or level of consciousness of the research issues is such that one is making a beginning through support for individual projects. One might anticipate considerable support being given in a field such as fisheries economics for example which is still an emerging field for LDC's but less support for economics per se where the level of trained individuals is adequate.	<p><b>Project Related Awards</b> will be retained to support pre-project and post-project training for individuals associated with Centre supported projects.</p> <p><b>Group Training</b> activities under this program would be characterized as training workshops to teach specific research skills to either prepare participants for an anticipated research project or to upgrade their skills in the course of a project. (3-P-84-0104 ; Training Course : Animal Production Systems would be an example of this mechanism used in this way).</p> <p><b>A Third Party</b> would assist in Project Development if it had particular skills or facilities to train participants to do better research within a particular project (3-P-85-0066 ; Training Course : Microcomputers For Research, and 3-P-85-0168 : Formation sur la fécondité des jeunes en Afrique, are examples).</p>
<b><u>B Program Development</u></b>	
Training under this program is intended for sectors and issues that no longer need nurturing at the project level. For example established networks of projects that are leading to the establishment of ongoing programs of research within established institutions would be eligible for support. Within research institutions in Asia and Latin America, for example, it may not be necessary or feasible for IDRC to provide comprehensive institutional support yet there may be research programs currently working on or planning to work on problems of interest to IDRC to provide longer term, sustained, research attention to certain development problems. (FAD support for the Aquaculture Development Activities at SEAFDEC is an example).	<p><b>Program Related Awards</b> will be retained to support both formal and informal training for individuals associated with current or planned research programs which fall within the mandates of the program units of the Divisions.</p> <p><b>Group Training</b> activities under this program would be characterized by training workshops in which the curriculum would integrate results and information or methodologies from groups already involved in a particular field of research. (3-P-84-0092 ; Training Workshop : Qualitative Research in Education is an example).</p> <p><b>A Third Party</b> could assist in Program Development if it had particular skills or facilities to train participants to do better research within a particular program of research. (3-P-85-0061 : Research Methods Focussing on Gender Issues is an example which combines both the Group Training and Third Party mechanisms).</p>



**TABLE II      Existing Training Mechanisms      Fitted to New Program Activities.**

<u>Program</u>	<u>Mechanisms</u>
<b><u>C Institutional Development</u></b>	
<p>FAD will use the program to support the development of institutions where research and training activities come together. This is the ultimate form of Centre support and in an ideal world will be the only form of support needed the year before the Centre completes its mission when on-going research into the problems of development is in the hands of institutions fully capable of formulating their own program of research and the individual projects within these programs. The pattern for FAD support for funding under this program has been set. Current projects with CIRES (3-P-85-0073) in West Africa the Consortium Graduate School in the Caribbean (3-P-85-0077) and USP (3-P-84-0007) in the South Pacific are examples of support to encourage the growth of training institutions within the Third World. The Selective Trainer/Trainee scheme ensures that whenever the opportunity arises FAD funds will be used explicitly or implicitly to strengthen training institutions.</p>	<p>In this program the Group Training and third party mechanisms can be used, when appropriate, to strengthen an institution when it is funded to provide a training service function to a particular project or program.</p>
<b><u>D Specialized Training</u></b>	
<p>From time to time FAD is called upon to provide training which falls outside the interests of the Centre's Program Divisions. The Pearson Fellowship, the Hague Academy, and many of the Research Fellows are examples.</p> <p>At other times FAD is asked to provide training of a type that cuts across the interests of all Program Divisions. FAD has to provide training in the problems of gender related data in Social Science research, the use of microcomputers in research, the use of SPSS adapted for microcomputers. FAD has also proposed training on research management. These training projects will be accommodated in this program.</p>	<p>Group training, third party and individual awards are mechanisms which could be used under this program.</p>

**TABLE II      Existing Training Mechanisms      Fitted to New Program Activities.**

<u>Program</u>	<u>Mechanisms</u>
<p><b><u>E Training for Careers in Development, Canada</u></b></p> <p>FAD makes use of Canadian training resources, when these are appropriate, across the full range of its programs. When calling on these resources FAD is well served even when it strives to obtain the service at least cost. The Centre has recognized the need to encourage Canadian researchers with interests which touch on development problems to take a professional interest in international development. The need to put the initiative of the LDC researcher before that of the Canadian however, has led to an awkward and somewhat equivocal relationship with the Canadian research Community.</p> <p>FAD has used its access to COOP funds to reduce the equivocation and to put in place programs specifically designed to encourage Canadians destined for academic careers to stay interested in the problems of international development. The new title for this program makes its aim explicit.</p>	<p>The YCR and Medical Exchange projects will be funded under this program activity.</p> <p>When additional COOP funds become available FAD will seek approval for a project which will provide support to Canadian academics wishing to take their first sabbatical leave and whose research is clearly connected with international development.</p>

. Have training demands been consistent with the Centre's overall priorities?

**. It will capture the "process" of HRD within particular field of research or institution.**

The new program framework will enable FAD (and the Program Divisions) to trace the evolution of a problem within a field of research or within an institution. If a particular problem continued to demand training support at the project development level and there was no indication of movement to program or institutional support we would want to know why. Possible causes might include, a particularly difficult area of research, a neglected area that required considerable investment in HRD, a brain drain of researchers trained for the problem or sector but enticed into other activities, the use of inappropriate training mechanisms etc.

**. It will allow finer tuning of HRD activities.**

Arguments can be made for a wider spectrum of training support particularly at the level of program development and institutional development. For instance FAD will be better able to judge when training for technicians, trainers, extension workers, policy analysts and managers is as important as training for researchers.

**. It will encourage longer term strategic planning of support to HRD.**

The Centre's concern for concentration versus persistence can be accommodated within the new program framework. It should be possible to judge where training is needed to prepare for research activities or where it is needed to maintain the critical mass of researchers and at what stage this mass is self sustaining through a research and training system that no longer needs Centre support.

**. It will be sufficiently flexible to incorporate different levels of HRD development within the wide range of sectors and problems encompassed by Centre supported research.**

TABLE II illustrates how each of the mechanisms currently used by FAD can be deployed within the new program framework.

### New Activities

Appendix 5 presents FAD's budget projections to FY 89/90. The table indicates how the budget will be structured to take account of the introduction of the new FAD Programs described above. The projected program appropriation for FAD were taken from PPR VII which predict a steady 6% share of the Centre's program resources and allows for growth of 2.5% from FY 87/88 to FY 88/89 and 4% from FY 88/89 to FY 89/90. From FY 81/87 to FY 87/88 a slight decrease in FAD funds is forecast. With inflation factored in, FAD funds proper are not predicted to increase in real terms.

Faced with a no growth situation FAD proposes to make only gradual adjustments to its training activities. The discussion below indicates where FAD will introduce new training activities as new or redistributed resources permit:

Under the program for **Project Development** FAD will allocate a steady \$800,000 a year for individual awards. An additional \$200,000 will be available for training projects in support of project development. A similar strategy will apply to the program for **Program Development**; a steady \$1,200,000 will be available for individual awards and \$200,000 will support training projects. If FAD were to enjoy increased resources some increase in each of these categories might be made to offset erosion due to inflation. FAD would also be prepared to divert funds from individual awards into training projects within each of these categories if this proved a more effective and efficient training mechanism for larger groups of trainees (3-P-84-0225; Training in Aquaculture at SEAFDEC AQD is a case in point).

FAD believes the new emphasis on the program for **Institutional Development** will provide the greatest scope for established and new approaches to training. It will provide for a wide range of training activities involving groups of trainees and individuals whose training (either as the product or process of the Centre-funded project) will strengthen an LDC institution.

Under this program FAD has funded two projects to test the problems and promise of support to program of higher education in LDC post secondary institutions; support for the Doctorat de Troisième Cycle in Rural Economics at the Centre Ivoirien de Recherches Economiques et Sociales (CIRES) (3-P-85-0073) and the Consortium Graduate School (CGS) at the University of the West Indies, the University of Surinam and the University of Guyana (3-P-85-0077). Lessons learned from these efforts will influence FAD's tentative plans to place greater emphasis on support for institutions of higher education in Latin America and perhaps in South East and South Asia.

It has been mentioned above that support for **Research Fellows** was suspended because of budgetary restraints. When exceptional individuals from key institutions are nominated for training FAD would consider reactivating this form of support under this program.

The project which supports the **International Foundation for Science** will be subsumed under this program. The project will be phased out by FY 87/88 and the funds it frees up will be reallocated to the program element of the **Pearson Fellowship Program**.

The program for **Specialized Training** will subsume the **Pearson Fellowship** as this program for training in Public Administration is out of the mainstream of Centre activities. This program also offers scope for experiments in training. Under this program FAD proposes to fund two experimental projects.

### **1. Training in Research Management for LDC Post Graduate Students**

This project would provide a six week course on the rudiments of the management of research institutions to postgraduate students who have completed MSc's or PhD's in Canada and who will very likely return to institutions where they will rise rapidly to managerial positions.

### **2. Support for the Field Research of LDC Graduate Students**

This project will provide scholarships to LDC post graduate students in Canada who do not have the funds to conduct their field research in their home countries. IDRC provides this opportunity routinely to its own awardees but a number of scholars supported in Canada by their home governments or other agencies are often obliged to orient their studies to Canadian topics of questionable value to the future for which they are preparing. If funds permit FAD will eventually place this program and the YCR on an equal footing as we feel that these programs provide the same type of opportunity to the Canadian and LDC students studying in Canada.

Under the **Training for Careers in Development, Canada**, the YCR project will continue. FAD is committed to the Medical Exchange project until FY 87/88 and will reassess its support at that time. Funds permitting FAD will bring forward the following program:

#### **Support for First Sabbaticals**

What FAD does for the Canadian graduate students through the YCR it would like to do for the younger professional academic. A project to provide support for the Canadian scholar who has oriented his research interests towards development and who wishes to take a **first sabbatical** to spend time conducting research in developing country is proposed.

#### **New Perspectives on Training**

FAD has commissioned Dr. Donald Simpson, a respected Educator and Education Researcher, to conduct a Human Resource Development Study of the capacity of Canadian Institutions to respond to increasing and changing requests from developing countries (3-A-84-4174).

The interim report of this study indicates that there are in Canada both the competence and experience to provide a wide range of training resources and mechanisms to trainees and training institutions in the Third World. A theme explored by the study is the importance of the private sector as a partner in training. In a number of fields of the applied sciences particularly in the frontier activities in biotechnology, energetics, applied electronics resource management (all of which will affect the research support and dissemination activities of the Centre), the private sector will be an important source of training. New ground must be broken to find new patterns of relationships which involve universities, private firms, LDC institutions and new mechanisms to tap this resource. The extent to which the Centre can encourage and use this resource will be closely monitored by FAD. The Division anticipates novel, perhaps risky but exciting developments in this regard. (The project (3-P-85-0001) Training: Technology Transfer and Adaptation, is a precursor of this new relationship with the private sector).

The proposal (to be considered by the March Meeting of the Board of Governors) for IDRC to take over the administration of the CIDA funded NSERC grant (3-C-85-8008) is an opportunity FAD will use to explore the match of training resources in Canada to LDC needs in the natural sciences and engineering.

Several other developments in training of potential importance for LDC's will be followed by FAD.

### **Manuals and Curriculum Materials**

Standard texts and related teaching materials are often inappropriate for training exercises focussing on development issues. FAD is receiving increasing requests to support the reworking of standard materials to incorporate case studies and other appropriate aids into curriculum packages. This is an expensive proposition which FAD will consider selectively where the investment will serve a large number of trainees. (3-P-85-0249 In Service Training for Educational Researchers is an example of this type of support).

### **Computer Aided Training**

The introduction of microcomputers into the schools of developed countries is now well established. While still the subject of controversy, an increasing amount of computer based instructional material is being prepared for today's students at all levels. Developments in Computer Aided Instruction presents an opportunity for training institutions in the LDC's that must be explored. As part of its exploration, FAD has partnered, with ISD, support for a training exercise which will use microcomputers in conjunction with training to implement the Debt Recording and Management System (DRMS) project (3-P-85-0319). FAD has also encouraged an ISD project in this domain at IRRI (3-P-85-0242 : Development of Microcomputer-based Instructional Resources).

### **Distance Education**

All of the items discussed above might be considered sub sets of the field of Distance Education. This involves techniques ranging from the well established programs of instruction by mail to newer techniques using television. The extent to which these techniques can be used to support research-related training or for linking Canadian (or other DC sources of expertise) to LDC trainees is worth careful monitoring and supporting in experimental ways when opportunities arise.

The extent to which FAD can be proactive in its advocacy of new training methods is a moot point given current funding constraints. What is certain is that these techniques cannot be developed for themselves but only in so far as they address the research related training needs indicated in the course of the Centre's overall support for research.

### **Training Data Bases**

With Energy Funds FAD commissioned a study of energy-related training resources in Canada (3-A-84-4252). One feature of this study is the preparation of an index on diskettes which can be searched by microcomputer. Rapid searches of various training parameters eg. Energy - petroleum, - economics - policy, can be made so that reference to the complete information in a training directory can be done with minimum time and maximum coverage.

FAD will distribute the product of the study to various groups to whom it might be useful - CIDA, AUCC, CBIE, WUSC CUSO, etc. Ready access to low cost IBMPC compatible computers is now reasonably assumed. If this low cost database approach to training resources attracts interest, FAD will seek support to establish a similar system for training related to development issues within Canada.

### **IV The Continuation of FAD's Strategic Planning**

This review provides an opportunity for FAD to think further about some features of its mandate for training within the overall operations of the Centre. Set out below are questions which the review might cover, in order to advise FAD as it makes its plans for the effective use of the Centre's training resources.

- . To what extent does the training mandate given to FAD cover the complete HRD activities of the Centre? Can one rationalize the current arrangement which places approximately 7% of the Centre's resources with FAD to fund training activities when considerable funds (estimated at 5.5%)\* are allocated for training by the Program and Support Divisions? FAD hesitates to raise this issue as it may lead to an unproductive discussion of territoriality. The A and B funding categories of support used by the Cooperative Programs

.../22

\* PINS data shows that from 1970-1985 Program Divisions provided \$31 million for training. The total Centre appropriations over the same period was \$558 million.

Division have been held up as a possible mechanism to ensure better accountability for the Centre's training resources. Treated in this way an A budget would be allocated each year for training activities which Program Divisions now cover through their appropriations for research; the B budget would be FAD's traditional budget. The A budget would not be controlled by FAD but rather overseen to ensure that the Centre was fully aware of the extent and the nature of its training activities. FAD's oversight of both the A and B training funds would also enable it to monitor all Centre funded training within the new program grid it proposes for its own activities thus ensuring a global view of trends in the application of resources dedicated to research related HRD.

Some elements of such an arrangement are already used. On some occasions FAD cannot contribute to a Program Division's training project but does agree to administer them (3-P-85-0165 : Study Seminar on Microelectronics, Automation and Industry) on others FAD contributes funds, shares the monitoring but leaves the administration with the Program Division (3-P-83-0336 : Editing and Publication Production Training).

Any new arrangement which was found to improve the Centre's accountability for training must not involve more bureaucracy.

- . To what extent will the restructuring of FAD program activities provide the Division with a better fit with the reorientation in the Centre's mission and mandate presented in PPR VII?
- . Has FAD reached the optimal level for support of individual awards? In FY 84/85 FAD made 188 awards (in addition to 22 new projects and 10 DAPS). The number of unsolicited requests received and those submitted by program staff of the other Divisions indicate a chronic need for both short term informal training and longer formal degree training. This is true of all the developing regions although particularly so of Africa. Because each award addresses a special training requirement, considerable administrative energy is needed to arrange and monitor each one. FAD must now assess whether or not it has reached the limit of its administrative carrying capacity for these awards.
- . Should FAD broaden its definition of training? Currently the training is "research related" that is it enables individuals or institutions to do better research. FAD receives increasing requests to provide training which, broadly speaking, could be considered training for extension and dissemination. For example if the fisheries program of AFNS supports research to develop a better fish net for the artisanal fishery of the southern region of Chile should FAD support a program to train fishermen in the use of these nets? Arguments can be made both for and against. Such training is an element of the development process which must follow research which produces new technology. However, allocating resources to such extension activities draws them away from those who need training to enter the research process.



- . It is policy for FAD to seek training opportunities in Canada when these do not exist in the Third World. Often suitable courses cannot be found in Canada and FAD places award holders in other developed countries. Increasingly FAD (and the Program Divisions) receive proposals from Canadian universities wishing to set up training programs useful for LDC trainees. Should FAD consider a shift in policy which would enable it to build a capacity for appropriate training in Canadian Universities?

## **V Staffing**

When the Fellowships Program was created in 1982 it consisted of six person years namely: an Associate Director, Senior Program Officer, Program Assistant an Operations Assistant and two secretaries. In 1983 a second senior program officer was appointed to work from ASRO. This established a policy of assigning additional professional staff to specific Regional Offices. With the creation of FAD in 1983 a senior program officer was placed in EARO. Subsequently SPO's were hired for LARO and WARO. Ideally FAD wishes to have an SPO serving each of the regional offices.

FAD will apply for additional staff as the Program Divisions increase their level of activities in SARO and MERO. For the moment the FAD officer in EARO keeps a watching brief and MERO and SARO operations are the responsibility of the SPO in ASRO. Annex 3 provides a projection of FAD staff needs to 1989/90.

FAD representatives in the regional offices appear to play a role which reaches beyond the strict adherence to FAD program activities. In East and West Africa, particularly, program staff report that a lack of trained and researchers within their fields hamper their efforts to encourage and support research. This is less so in Asia and Latin America but in these regions too the Program Divisions direct considerable resources towards in-project training: for FY 84/85 Program Divisions allocated \$627,000 to training in ASRO and approximately one million dollars in LARO. Given this common concern for the support of appropriate training, FAD's regional staff find themselves at the focal point of discussions of measures to overcome this basic weakness. Through reference to FAD program officers in the regional offices where FAD is represented a more strategic view of HRD in support of training for research is taken. Program officers from the Program Divisions can be encouraged to think not only of their immediate training needs to support project development but also to take a longer term view of how best to strengthen appropriate institutions through a combination of research and training support. FAD believes that its regional representatives will play a key role in the new thrust within the Centre to identify key institutions around which several Divisions of the Centre can co-ordinate their support.

## Annex 1

President's Memorandum of August 18, 1981 presenting the Guidelines from the Training Policy Study. The excerpt from the TPS which was circulated with this memorandum have not been included as they are presented in Table I of this statement.

A large part of the Board discussions concerned the balance between research project-related training (Guideline 3) and projects which were primarily of a training nature (Guideline 4). There was general endorsement of the proposal that the Centre should concentrate on developing research skills by "enabling scientists to do research". The emphasis on directing most support for training through research projects was accepted. The fourth guideline, recommending that IDRC experiment with training projects and non-core support for developing country training institutions, is less familiar to the Centre. It was suggested that we move cautiously and tap the accumulated experience of other organizations such as the Ford or Rockefeller Foundations before attempting in any significant way to fill any gaps they may leave. The Board was willing, however, to consider experimental approaches to building research capability through primarily training projects.

Some Board members cautioned that the fifth guideline about encouraging training in Third World countries could lead to in-breeding in smaller countries. However, it was accepted that, as outlined in the report, factors such as relevance and cost should weigh heavily in the Centre's preference for locating training in developing countries.

The study was hampered by a lack of reliable data on Centre activities and there was a number of issues raised which the Planning Office felt should be explored in more depth. I believe the Centre's support for training has become so important that I accept the recommendation in the paper that the Centre should monitor training activities on an ongoing basis. I have asked Allan Rix, the Associate Director of the Fellowship Program to take on the responsibility of establishing an informal Training Committee. The responsibilities of this committee are summarized on pages 10 and 11 of the attached recommendations.

FAD Staff Projections

	85/86	86/87	87/88	88/89	89/90
<u>Ottawa</u>					
<u>Div Mon</u>					
Professional	1	1	1	1	1
Support	3	3	3	3	3
<u>Tech Sup</u>					
Professional	2	2	2	2	2
Support	2	2	2	2	3
<u>ASRO</u>					
Professional	1	1	1	1	1
<u>EARO</u>					
Professional	1	1	1	1	1
<u>LARO</u>					
Professional	1	1	1	1	1
<u>MERO</u>					
Professional				1	1
<u>SARO</u>					
Professional			1	1	1
<u>WARO</u>					
Professional		1	1	1	1
<u>Total</u>					
Professional	7	7	8	9	9
	5	5	5	5	6

Notes: Support Staff in regional offices is covered by the regional office budget. FAD has a full time program assistant in ASRO and a half time program assistant in LARO.

# Categories of HRD/Training Support Since the Inception of IDRC

Annex4

	Social Sciences & Human Resources Program								Sr VP	Fellowships Program					FAD		
	71-72	72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77	77-78	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86	86-87	
AWARD:																	
a IN PROJECT AWARDS	*																
x PHD THESIS AWARDS (CAN)																	
x RESEARCH ASSOCIATE AWARDS (CAN)																	
s SENIOR FELLOWSHIP AWARDS																	
x RESEARCH ASSOCIATE AWARDS (DE)																	
a <sup>2</sup> INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR SCIENCE																	
x SENIOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATE																	
x TRAVEL & RESEARCH GRANTS																	
o PRE PROJECT AWARDS																	
o POST PROJECT AWARDS																	
x RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP AWARDS																	
o PEARSON FELLOWSHIP AWARDS																	
x PHD THESIS AWARDS (DC)																	
x POPULATION RESEARCH AWARDS																	
x DISPLACED SCHOLAR AWARDS																	
x PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AWARDS (CAN) <sup>1</sup>																	
a <sup>3</sup> HAGUE ACADEMY AWARDS																	
s CENTRE INTERNSHIP AWARDS																	
x MANAGEMENT TRAINING AWARDS																	
x PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AWARDS (DC) <sup>2</sup>																	
L SCIENTIFIC MANUSCRIPTS AWARDS (DC)																	
x RESEARCH MANAGEMENT AWARDS																	
o GROUP TRAINING AWARDS																	
x SOUTH/NORTH RESEARCH AWARDS																	
o PROGRAM RELATED AWARDS																	
o YOUNG CANADIAN RESEARCHERS																	
L ENERGY RELATED AWARDS																	
L MEDICAL EXCHANGE AWARDS																	
o INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM																	
o NEW INITIATIVES																	
o THIRD PARTY AWARDS																	
Fellowship Budget Allocation (\$000)	565	738	922	1843	1810	2207	2122	2073	1812	2205	2550	3204	4705	4919	4550	5200	

x Award category cancelled

L Limited time period for award at outset

o On-going award category

s Award category suspended

a<sup>1</sup> Absorbed pre/post award category/some funded by divisions

a<sup>2</sup> Absorbed by third party training category

a<sup>3</sup> Absorbed by group training

\*1 Continued to fund until 1981-82

\*2 Co-op assumed financial responsibility

1 Replaced the old research associate awards

2 When awards philosophy changed

\* Run by individual divisions until 1975

FAD Budget Projections

	85/86 Actual	86/87 Actual	87/88 Est	88/89 Est	89/90 Est
<u>New Categories</u>					
1. Project Devel.*	-	-	(a) 800	800	800
	-	-	(b) 200	200	200
2. Program Devel.*	-	-	(a) 1,200	1,200	1,200
	-	-	(b) 200	200	200
3. Inst. Devel.	-	-	1,573	1,706	1,922
4. Specialized Tr.	-	-	-	-	-
Pearson*	-	-	850	850	850
Management	-	-	100	100	100
Admin. of Awards*	-	-	150	150	150
Sub Total FAD	-	-	5,073	5,206	5,422
5. Careers in Dev. (COOP)					
YCR	-	-	450	450	450
Field Res.	-	-	100	100	100
Med. Exchange	-	-	250	150	-
First Sabbatical	-	-	100	200	350
Sub Total COOP	-	-	900	900	900
<u>Old Categories</u>					
Prog. for Dev. Coun.	4,820	5,200	-	-	-
Special Prog.	-	-	-	-	-
COOP Prog.	700	700	-	-	-
Energy (SPA)	150	200	-	-	-
DAP	150	200	250	250	300
Tech. Sup.	572	614	788	983	1,051
Div. Manag.	239	258	276	295	315
TOTAL	6,481	6,972	7,287	7,534	7,888

\*These funds will continue to be appropriated under the 3-F-6000 project

1. The table indicates the changed budget configuration to accompany the new arrangement of FAD programs discussed in the text.
2. The FAD Budget for 1987-88 onward is taken from PPR VII Table 2 page 34.
3. Technical Support assumes an appointment of an SPO to SARO for 87/88, an SPO to MERO for 88/89 and a support staff appointment to Ottawa in 89/90.
4. (a) Indicates the allocation for individual awards and (b) an allocation for projects.

This annex consists of three tables which show the distribution of FAD resources for FY 84-85.

1. FAD Funds Distributed by Regional Offices.
2. FAD Funds Distributed by Division.
3. FAD Funds Distributed by Program Unit.

PROGRAMS	COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS			HEALTH SCIENCES				COMMUNICATIONS			OCGT	OSGC		FAD
	ALLOCATED \$	ESC \$	TLE \$	OFD \$	TID \$	MCH \$	WSS \$	OEH \$	JUR \$	MED \$	MAN \$	ADM \$	LAM \$	FAD \$
Group Training	967,390	67,440 7 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	91,000 9 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	190,770 20 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %
Institutional Development	557,780	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	266,600 48 %
New Initiatives	172,880	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %
Research Fellows	124,930	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	19,580 16 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %
Third Party	350,000	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	350,000 100 %
SUB TOTAL	2,172,980	67,440 3 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	91,000 4 %	0 0 %	19,580 1 %	0 0 %	190,770 9 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	616,600 28 %
INDIVIDUAL AWARDS														
Person	487,316	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	78,325 16 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %
Project	443,704	11,945 3 %	78,149 18 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	37,390 8 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %
Subproject	325,729	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	5,855 2 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	12,200 4 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %
Program Related	1,281,540	0 0 %	0 0 %	17,935 1 %	126,248 10 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	25,563 2 %	50,402 4 %	30,980 2 %	22,043 2 %	10,708 1 %	33,450 3 %	20,050 2 %
SUB TOTAL	2,538,289	11,945 0 %	78,149 3 %	17,935 1 %	132,103 5 %	0 0 %	37,390 1 %	25,563 1 %	50,402 2 %	43,180 2 %	22,043 1 %	10,708 0 %	33,450 1 %	20,050 1 %
YER	248,319	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	65,500 26 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	44,951 18 %	20,000 8 %	20,000 8 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %
Energy	140,000	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %
TOTAL	5,099,588	79,385 2 %	78,149 2 %	17,935 0 %	197,603 4 %	91,000 2 %	37,390 1 %	90,094 2 %	70,402 1 %	253,950 5 %	22,043 0 %	10,708 0 %	33,450 1 %	636,650 12 %



PROGRAMS	N	ALLOCATED \$	N	AFNS \$	N	MSD \$	N	ISD \$	N	SSD \$	N	COOP \$	N	COMM \$	N	DCGT \$	N	OSGC \$	N	FAD \$
Group Training	12	967,390	4	439,220 45 %	1	91,000 9 %	1	64,380 7 %	3	114,580 12 %	2	67,440 7 %	1	190,770 20 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0
Institutional Development	5	557,780	2	216,000 39 %	0	0 0 %	1	0 0 %	1	75,180 13 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	1	266,600 48
New Initiative	1	172,880	1	172,880 100 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0
Security	1	350,000	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	1	350,000 100
Research Fellow	3	124,930	0	0 0 %	1	19,580 16 %	0	0 0 %	2	105,350 84 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0
SUB TOTAL	22	2,172,980	7	828,100 38 %	2	110,580 5 %	2	64,380 3 %	6	295,110 14 %	2	67,440 3 %	1	190,770 9 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	2	616,600 28
UAP	10	150,000	2	25,100 17 %	1	13,910 9 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	1	975 1 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	6	109,280 73
INDIVIDUAL AWARDS																				
Pearson	12	487,316	4	156,325 32 %	2	78,325 16 %	2	86,386 18 %	4	166,280 34 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0
Preproject	28	443,704	11	193,242 44 %	1	37,390 8 %	7	106,040 24 %	3	16,938 4 %	6	90,094 20 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0
Postproject	31	325,729	10	119,846 37 %	1	5,855 2 %	0	0 0 %	19	187,828 58 %	0	0 0 %	1	12,200 4 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0
Program Related	99	1,281,540	29	399,427 31 %	11	151,811 12 %	12	155,951 12 %	40	408,788 32 %	1	17,935 1 %	5	81,382 6 %	2	32,751 3 %	2	33,450 3 %	0	0 0
SUB TOTAL	170	2,538,289	54	868,840 34 %	15	273,381 11 %	21	348,377 14 %	66	779,834 31 %	7	108,029 4 %	6	93,582 4 %	2	32,751 1 %	2	33,450 1 %	0	0 0
YLR	15	248,319	1	20,000 8 %	8	110,451 44 %	0	0 0 %	4	77,868 31 %	0	0 0 %	2	40,000 16 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0
Energy	3	140,000	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	69,818 50 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0 %	0	0 0
TOTAL FAD	220	5,249,588	64	1,742,040 33 %	26	508,322 10 %	23	412,757 8 %	76	1,222,630 23 %	9	175,469 3 %	10	325,327 6 %	2	32,751 1 %	2	33,450 1 %	8	725,880 14

Project #	Project Devel	Program Devel	Instit Devel	Special Train	Careers Canada	Energy	Admin	TOTALS
GROUP TRAINING								
84-0012		2,340						
84-0036		32,150	32,150					
84-0039		23,250	23,250					
84-0037		46,500	46,500					
84-0336		63,590	63,590	63,590				
84-0092	49,300							
84-0103		23,960						
84-0104	31,460							
84-0138		41,300						
84-0180		91,000						
84-0225			269,260					
84-0255		32,050	32,050					
SUB TOT GT	80,760	357,200	469,840	63,590	0	0	0	567,390
INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT								
84-0144		32,750	32,750					
84-0163			144,000					
84-0203			9,690					
84-0230		36,000	36,000					
84-0243			266,600					
SUB TOT ID	0	68,750	489,200	0	0	0	0	557,950
THIRD PARTY								
84-0235		350,000						
SUB TOT TP	0	350,000	0	0	0	0	0	350,000
NEW INITIATIVES								
84-0051	88,440	88,440						
SUB TOT NI	88,440	88,440	0	0	0	0	0	176,880
RESEARCH FELLOWS								
84-0240			16,590					
84-0241			76,600					
84-0306	14,225		14,225					
SUB TOT RF	14,225	0	110,705	0	0	0	0	124,930
INDIVIDUAL AWARDS								
PEARSON				487,316				
PROG REL				1,281,540				
PROJ REL				769,433				
ADMIN						66,140		
CONTIN						46,537		
SUB TOT	769,433	1,281,540	0	487,316	0	0	112,677	2,548,866
COOP PROG								
YCR				248,319				
SUB TOT	0	0	0	0	248,319	0	0	248,319
ENERGY						150,000		150,000
TOTAL	950,858	2,140,990	1,069,575	650,906	248,319	150,000	112,677	6,240,285
PER CENT	16	34	20	11	5	3	3	100

Note

Page 1 uses 84-87 data page 2 uses 85/86 data

**Table 3B: Level of Training by Division and Program Unit.**

Questions Answered

How does the level of training of IDRC awards vary by areas of IDRC interest, represented by IDRC Divisions and Program Units?

**Table 3C: Level of Training by Region and Country.**

Questions Answered

How does the level of training of IDRC award vary by region and country?

**Table 4: Distribution of Host Institutions by IDRC Division.**

Questions Answered

What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries?

**Table 5A: FAD Award Categories by Region and Country.**

Questions Answered

How does the type of IDRC award vary by region and country.

**Table 5B: FAD Award Categories by Division and Program Unit.**

Questions Answered

How does the type of award vary by IDRC interest, represented by IDRC's Divisions and Program Units? To what extent have Program Units used FAD awards?

**Table 5C: Award Categories by Level of Training.**

Questions Answered

At what level of study are categories of IDRC awards concentrated?

**Table 6: Distribution of IDRC Awards by Field of Study.**

Questions Answered

How and to what extent have different fields of study supported by IDRC made use of training awards?

TABLE 1A: TIME SERIES DISTRIBUTION OF IDRC AWARD HOLDERS BY SEX, REGIONAL OFFICE AND COUNTRY

Questions Answered: What is the growth and distribution of IDRC Awards by country? How has this changed over time? What is the proportion of awards split between men and women? How has this changed over time? How does the proportion of awards given to men and women vary by country, and how has this changed over time?

REGION	COUNTRY	70-72			73-75			76-78			79-81			82-85			TOTAL		
		M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
LAPO	ARGENTINA	2	0	2	2	0	2	3	0	3	1	1	2	2	5	4	10	6	16
	BARBADOS	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	BELIZE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
	BOLIVIA	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	4	5	3	6	0	0	0
	BRAZIL	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CHILE	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	1	6	4	3	7	1	5	2	0	1	0
	COLOMBIA	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	3	10	4	4	8	15	5	16	0	0	0
	COSTA RICA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CUBA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	DOMINICA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ECUADOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	3	0	4	0	0
	EL SALVADOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	GUATEMALA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	GUYANA	1	0	1	2	0	2	0	4	10	1	1	2	4	0	1	14	0	0
	HAITI	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
	HONDURAS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
	JAMAICA	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	1	4	1	0	4	1	2	2	0	0	0
	MEXICO	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	2	3	1	4	0	0	0
	NICARAGUA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PANAMA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PARAGUAY	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
	PERU	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	4	1	5	7	1	2	10	0	0
	SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADIN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
	TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	1	3	0	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0
	URUGUAY	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0
	VENEZUELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
MERO	ALGERIA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	EGYPT	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	0
	IRAN	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	JORDAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
	LEBANON	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
	MOROCCO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
	PAKISTAN	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0
	SUDAN	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
	SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	TUNISIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
	TURKEY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAPO	BANGLADESH	0	0	0	3	0	3	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	INDIA	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	14	4	0	0
	NEPAL	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SRI LANKA	1	0	1	2	0	2	5	0	0	5	0	0	2	15	34	0	0	0

\*\*\*\*\*  
 TABLE 1B: TIME SERIES DISTRIBUTION OF IDRC AWARD HOLDERS BY SEX AND REGION  
 \*\*\*\*\*

Questions Answered: This table summarizes the information in Table 1A. What is the growth and distribution of IDRC Awards by region over time? What is the proportion of awards given to men and women? How does this vary over time?

REGION	70-72			73-75			76-78			79-81			82-85			TOTAL		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
NORTH AMERICA AND EUROPE	27	4	31	54	10	64	35	13	48	29	7	36	45	41	86	190	75	265
ASPO	0	0	0	8	2	10	22	8	30	66	17	83	112	33	145	208	60	268
EAPO	0	0	0	6	0	6	26	5	31	24	4	28	84	17	101	140	26	166
LAPO	4	0	4	16	1	17	46	11	57	24	21	45	85	47	132	175	80	255
NEPO	1	0	1	7	2	9	20	1	21	9	1	10	10	4	14	47	8	55
SAP0	2	0	2	12	1	13	17	1	18	33	1	34	54	3	57	118	6	124
WAP0	0	0	0	11	2	13	23	2	25	17	0	17	53	7	60	104	11	115
	34	4	38	114	18	132	189	41	230	202	51	253	443	152	595	982	266	1248

\*\*\*\*\*  
 TABLE 2B: TIME SERIES DISTRIBUTION OF IDRC AWARD HOLDERS BY SEX AND AWARD CATEGORY  
 \*\*\*\*\*

Questions Answered: How does the distribution of IDRC Awards by sex vary by type of award?  
 How has this changed over time?  
 Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

AWARD CATEGORY	70-72			73-75			76-79			79-81			82-85			TOTAL		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Centre Internship	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2
Displaced Scholar	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	16
In Project Award	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	4	5	0	5
LDC Trainee	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Management Training Award	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	4
Pearson Fellowship	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	1	15	22	6	28	36	7	43	72	14	86
Ph.D Thesis Award (Can)	8	1	9	15	4	19	8	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	11	42
Ph.D Thesis Award (DC)	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	2	15	4	0	4	0	0	0	17	2	19
Post-Project Award	0	0	0	3	1	4	30	6	36	41	12	53	52	15	67	126	34	160
Pre-Project Award	0	0	0	4	1	5	19	9	28	20	16	36	61	15	76	104	41	145
Professional Development Award (Can)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	7	29	5	4	9	27	11	38
Professional Development Award (DC)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	12	1	0	1	13	0	13
Programme Related Award	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	2	41	234	75	309	273	77	350
Research Associate Award (Can)	17	3	20	24	5	29	23	6	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	25	14	39
Research Associate Award (DC)	0	0	0	44	5	49	55	5	60	30	8	38	0	0	0	129	18	147
Research Fellowship	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	4	0	4
Scientific Manuscripts Award	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2
Senior Fellowship	9	0	9	7	1	8	4	0	4	2	0	2	3	0	3	25	1	26
Senior Research Associate	0	0	0	2	0	2	11	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	14
South-North Research Award	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	9	7	2	9
Travel and Research Grant in Intern	0	0	0	15	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	16
Young Canadian Researchers' Award	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	34	70	36	34	70
	34	4	38	114	18	132	189	41	230	202	51	253	443	152	595	982	266	1248

\*\*\*\*\*  
 TABLE 3B: LEVEL OF TRAINING BY DIVISION AND PROGRAM UNIT 1  
 \*\*\*\*\*

Questions answered: How does the level of training of IDRC Awards vary  
 by areas of IDRC interest, represented by IDRC  
 divisions and program units? Data as of  
 THURS, MARCH 13, 1986

DIVISION	PROGRAM UNIT	BACHELORS	MASTERS	DOCTORATE	NON-DEGREE	TOTAL
AFNS	AGE	1	10	2	31	44
	CAP	0	24	29	78	131
	FIS	0	15	2	90	107
	FOR	0	7	3	37	47
	PPS	0	9	5	20	34
	DIVISION TOTAL	---	---	---	---	---
		1	65	41	256	363
COMM	JUR	0	2	0	8	10
	MED	0	8	3	21	32
	DIVISION TOTAL	---	---	---	---	---
		0	10	3	29	42
COOP	ECO	0	3	0	0	3
	EDU	0	1	0	1	2
	ESC	0	2	6	4	12
	FIS	0	0	0	2	2
	OFD	0	5	0	1	6
	DIVISION TOTAL	---	---	---	---	---
		0	11	6	8	25

\*\*\*\*\*  
TABLE 3B: LEVEL OF TRAINING BY DIVISION AND PROGRAM UNIT 3  
\*\*\*\*\*

Questions answered: How does the level of training of IDRC Awards vary  
by areas of IDRC interest, represented by IDRC  
divisions and program units? Data as of  
THURS, MARCH 13, 1986

DIVISION	PROGRAM UNIT	BACHELORS	MASTERS	DOCTORATE	NON-DEGREE	TOTAL
SS	AGE	0	0	0	5	5
	ECO	1	21	55	107	184
	EDU	0	15	36	126	177
	FIS	0	3	0	0	3
	IFD	0	0	0	1	1
	OEH	0	0	0	1	1
	POP	0	7	11	29	47
	STEP	0	3	9	41	53
	UND	0	2	4	8	14
	URB	0	6	3	32	41
		---	---	---	---	---
	DIVISION TOTAL	1	57	118	350	526
UNDEFINED		0	3	0	18	21
		---	---	---	---	---
GRAND TOTAL		5	231	177	835	1248



\*\*\*\*\*  
 ;  
 TABLE 3C: LEVEL OF TRAINING BY REGION AND COUNTRY  
 \*\*\*\*\*

2

Questions Answered: How does the level of training of IDRC awards vary  
 by the region and country of the award holder?  
 Data as of WED, MARCH 12, 1986

REGION COUNTRY	BACHELORS	MASTERS	DOCTORATE	NON-DEGREE	TOTAL
Burundi	0	1	2	1	4
Ethiopia	0	3	7	8	18
Kenya	0	6	4	18	28
Lesotho	0	1	0	1	2
Malawi	0	2	1	4	7
Mauritius	1	0	1	1	3
Mozambique	0	0	0	2	2
Rwanda	0	0	1	0	1
Seychelles	0	1	0	0	1
Somalia	0	0	0	2	2
Swaziland	0	1	0	0	1
Uganda	0	5	3	24	32
United Republic of Tanzania	0	14	8	21	43
Zambia	0	2	1	3	6
Zimbabwe	0	2	0	10	12
	---	---	---	---	---
REGION TOTAL	1	39	29	97	166
LARO					
Argentina	0	1	1	14	16
Barbados	0	1	1	2	4
Belize	0	1	0	1	2

\*\*\*\*\*  
 TABLE 3C: LEVEL OF TRAINING BY REGION AND COUNTRY 4  
 \*\*\*\*\*

Questions Answered: How does the level of training of IDRC awards vary  
 by the region and country of the award holder?  
 Data as of WED, MARCH 12, 1986

REGION COUNTRY	BACHELORS	MASTERS	DOCTORATE	NON-DEGREE	TOTAL
Egypt	0	2	1	20	23
Iran	0	1	0	0	1
Jordan	0	0	0	2	2
Lebanon	0	0	0	7	7
Morocco	0	1	0	1	2
Pakistan	0	1	0	5	6
Sudan	0	0	2	7	9
Syrian Arab Republic	0	0	1	0	1
Tunisia	0	0	0	1	1
Turkey	0	0	0	2	2
	---	---	---	---	---
REGION TOTAL	0	5	4	46	55
SARO					
Bangladesh	0	2	4	15	21
India	0	2	2	44	48
Nepal	0	6	3	10	19
Sri Lanka	0	3	3	30	36
	---	---	---	---	---
REGION TOTAL	0	13	12	99	124
WARO					
Burkina Faso	0	1	3	2	6
Cameroon	0	2	4	1	7
Cape Verde	0	0	0	1	1
Central African Republic	0	0	0	1	1
Chad	0	1	0	0	1

TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

HOST INSTITUTION	AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
unspecified institution	9	3	1	3	1	0	19	1	37
COUNTRY TOTAL	9	3	1	3	1	0	19	1	37
ALGERIA									
University of Algiers	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA									
Haliburton Hospital	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
ARGENTINA									
unspecified institution	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Centro de Investigaciones Sociales sobre el Estado y la Administraci	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Comision Economica para America Latina (CEPAL)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Instituto de Integracion Andina	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	7
AUSTRALIA									
Australian Institute of Marine Science	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Australian National University	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
MacQuarie University	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Monash University	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Queensland Herbarium	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

	HOST INSTITUTION	AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
BOTSWANA										
	Rural Industries Innovation Centre (RIIC)	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	University of Botswana	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
BRAZIL										
	unspecified institution	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Centro Brasileiro de Analise E Planejamento (CEBRAP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Centro de Tecnologia Promon	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Instituto de Universitario de Pesquisas do Rio de Janeiro	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Instituto Universitario de Pesquisas	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	Instituto Universitario de Pesquisas (IUPERJ)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	Moro da Conceição	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	Universidade Estadual de Campinas	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
	Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Universidade Federal do Parana	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Universidade de Sao Paulo	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Universidade Federal da Bahia	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Universidade Federal de Pernambuco	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Universidade Federal do Parana	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	University of Caena	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		3	0	1	4	2	0	9	0	19

TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

[illegible]

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES. MARCH 11, 1986

HOST INSTITUTION		AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
	York University	0	1	9	0	0	0	6	1	17
COUNTRY TOTAL		110	11	25	47	25	0	153	8	379
CHILE										
	Comision Economico y Social	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Programa Interdisciplinario de Investigaciones en Educacion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Programa Interdisciplinario de Investigaciones en Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Universidad de Chile	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	University of Talcahuano	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		2	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	8
CHINA										
	unspecified institution	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Regional Lead Centre in China (RLCC)	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	University of Beijing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		16	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	18
COLOMBIA										
	Accion Cultural Popular (APCO)	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Centro Internacional de Educacion y Desarrollo Humano	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Centro Internacional de Investigaciones para el Desarrollo	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Institute Geographico	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

HOST INSTITUTION:

HOST INSTITUTION		AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UNO	TOTAL
ECUADOR	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
EGYPT	Alexandria University	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	American University of Cairo	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Egyptian Ministry	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
	High Institute of Public Health	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	6
EL SALVADOR	Ministerio de Planificacion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Sección de Pesca y Casa Marítima	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
FIJI	University of the South Pacific	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	5
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	5
FRANCE	unspecified institution	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Centre international de hautes études agronomiques méditerrané	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Conservatoire national des arts et métiers	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes de Paris	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Ecole Supérieure d'Agronomie Tropicale	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

HOST INSTITUTION

[illegible]



TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

HOST INSTITUTION	AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
College of Arts, Science and Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Discovery Bay Marine Laboratory	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Jamaica Broadcasting Corporation	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
University of the West Indies	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	5
COUNTRY TOTAL	2	1	0	1	3	0	3	0	10
JORDAN									
University of Jordan	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
KENYA									
unspecified institution	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3
African Medical Research Foundation	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
East African Institute for Meteorological Training and Research	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
East African Veterinary Research Organization	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
I.D.R.C. Regional Office	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Kenya Institute of Mass Communication	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kenyatta University College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Ministry of Housing and Social Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
National Museum of Nairobi	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Otrum Mission Hospital	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
University of Nairobi	7	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	19

TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

	HOST INSTITUTION	AFHS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
MARTINIQUE										
	Université de Montréal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
MEXICO										
	Asociacion Mexicana de Produccion Animal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	El Colegio de Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	El Colegio de Michoacan	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Instituto de Enseñanza e Investigación en Ciencias Agrícolas	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Instituto Nacional de Cardiología Ignacio Chavez	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	7
	Secretaría de Agricultura y Recursos Hidráulicos	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Universidad Iberoamericana	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Universidad Iberoamericana de México	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		2	1	0	1	0	0	13	0	17
NEPAL										
	Tribhuvan University	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
NETHERLANDS										
	Centre for the Study of Education in Developing Countries (CESO)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Institute of Social Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	International Agriculture Centre	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

HOST INSTITUTION	AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
Gorgas Tropical Medicine Laboratory	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
PAPUA NEW GUINEA									
National Broadcasting Corporation	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Paramedic College	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
PARAGUAY									
unspecified institution	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociales	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociologicos	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Facultat Latinoamerica de Ciencias Sociales	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
PERU									
unspecified institution	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Asociacion Peruana para el Fomento de las Ciencias Sociales (FOMCIEN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Centro de Estudios Para el Desarrollo y la Participacion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Centro de Publicaciones Educativas	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Escuela Nacional de Ingenieria Tecnica	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Instituto Geofisico del Peru	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
TAREA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Universidad Nacional de Agraria	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

	HOST INSTITUTION	AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
SAMOA	University of Western Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
SENEGAL	unspecified institution	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
	Institute Africain de Développement Economique et de Planification	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
	Institute National d'Etude et d'Action pour le Développement de l'	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Office de la recherche scientifique et technique de outre-mer (ORS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Université de Dakar	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		2	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	8
SIERRA LEONE	Serabu Hospital	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	University of Sierra Leone	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
SINGAPORE	Asia Hotel	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	18
	Institute of South East Asian Studies	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	International Development Research Centre (IDRC)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
	National University of Singapore	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	17
COUNTRY TOTAL		16	1	18	1	1	0	0	2	39

TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

HOST INSTITUTION		AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	Central Bureau of Statistics	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
THAILAND	unspecified institution	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Asian Institute of Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
TOGO	University of Benin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO	University of the West Indies	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
COUNTRY TOTAL		3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
TUNISIA	unspecified institution	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
UNITED KINGDOM	Association for Information Management	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Bedford College	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Centre of South East Asian Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	City University	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
	College of Librarianship Wales	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

HOST INSTITUTION	AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
University of East Anglia	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
University of Edinburgh	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
University of Essex	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
University of London	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	4
University of Manchester	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
University of Oxford	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3
University of Reading	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3
University of Sheffield	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
University of Southampton	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
University of Stirling	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
University of Sussex	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	2	32
University of Technology	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
University of Wales	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	4
University of Warwick	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
World Friendship House	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wye College	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL	14	4	0	24	15	0	68	2	127
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA									
Capital Development Authority	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Ministry of Health	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
University of Dar es Salaam	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

\*\*\*\*\*  
 TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS  
 \*\*\*\*\*

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES. MARCH 11, 1986

HOST INSTITUTION	AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
International Research Associates	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Iowa State University	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
John Hopkins University	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Johns Hopkins University	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
MEDEX Northwest	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Michigan State University	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
National Fisheries Centre	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
North Carolina State University	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Northwestern University	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Pennsylvania State University	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Purdue University	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
Research Triangle Institute	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Rutgers University	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Stanford University	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	4
State University of New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Sylvia Medical Centre	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Texas A & M University	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
United Nations Centre for Housing, Building and Planning	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Université d'Hawaii	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
University of Arizona	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3
University of California	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6

TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF HOST INSTITUTIONS BY IDRC DIVISIONS

Questions answered: What institutions are IDRC award holders sent to? How are they distributed by IDRC areas of interest, represented by IDRC Divisions? To what extent are they sent to institutions in Canada, other developed countries and the developing countries? Data as of TUES, MARCH 11, 1986

HOST INSTITUTION		AFNS	COMM	COOP	HSD	ISD	OCGT	SSD	UND	TOTAL
URUGUAY	unspecified institution	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
VENEZUELA	PAHO/WHO Research and Reference Centre on Vector Biology and Control	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Universidad Central de Venezuela	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Universidad de Los Andes	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3
ZAIRE	Département de démographie	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
ZAMBIA	Commonwealth Youth Development Study Centre	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	University of Zambia	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
ZIMBABWE	Farming System Research Methods Regional Workshop	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	International Union of Forestry Research	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Ministry of Health	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	University of Zimbabwe	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
COUNTRY TOTAL		5	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	7
TOTAL		366	42	57	167	79	23	493	21	1248



Questions Answered: This table summarizes the information in Table 5A. How are categories of awards spread across regions?  
 Data as of MON, APRIL 21, 1986

REGION	DISP	IN	INTERN	LDC	MANA	PDCA	PDDC	PF	PHDCA	PHDDC	POST	PRA	PRE	RAACA	RAADC	RF	SCIE	SF	SN	SRA	TRAV	TOTAL
ASRO	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	21	0	1	46	130	38	0	22	2	0	2	2	2	0	268
EARO	14	0	0	0	2	0	5	18	0	3	11	62	34	0	12	0	0	2	1	2	0	166
LARO	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	1	3	56	75	40	2	38	1	0	7	1	5	0	255
MERO	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	0	2	6	6	3	0	24	0	0	2	0	2	0	55
SARO	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	4	18	44	10	1	28	0	0	4	3	1	0	124
WARO	0	4	0	1	0	0	2	11	1	6	18	28	18	1	22	0	0	0	2	1	0	115
TOTAL	16	7	0	1	4	0	13	85	2	19	155	345	143	4	146	3	0	17	9	13	0	983

TABLE 5A: TYPE OF AWARD BY REGION AND COUNTRY

1

Questions Answered: How does the type of award vary by the country of origin of the award holder? How are categories of awards spread across regions?  
Data as of MON, APRIL 21, 1986

REGION	COUNTRY	DISP	IN	INTERN	LDC	MANA	PDCA	PDDC	PF	PHDCA	PHDDC	POST	PRA	PRE	RAACA	RAADC	RF	SCIE	SF	SN	SRA	TRAV	TOTAL
ASRO	CHINA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	20	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	FIJI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	INDONESIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	14	36	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
	MALAYSIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	10	18	3	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	43
	PAPUA NEW GUINEA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	PHILIPPINES	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	10	29	10	0	4	1	0	2	0	1	0	63
	REPUBLIC OF KOREA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	9
	SAMOA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SOLOMON ISLANDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	THAILAND	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	7	20	8	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
	TONGA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	VIET NAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
REGION TOTAL		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	21	0	1	46	130	38	0	22	2	0	2	2	2	0	268
EARO	ANGOLA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	BOTSWANA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	BURUNDI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	ETHIOPIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	18
	KENYA	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	13	3	0	4	0	0	2	0	1	0	28

Questions Answered: How does the type of award vary by the country of origin of the award holder? How are categories of awards spread across regions?  
 Data as of MON, APRIL 21, 1986

REGION	COUNTRY	DISP	IN	INTERN	LDC	MANA	PDCA	PDDC	PF	PHDCA	PHDDC	POST	PRA	PRE	RAACA	RAADC	RF	SCIE	SF	SN	SRA	TRAV	TOTAL
	LESOTHO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	MALAWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	MAURITIUS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	MOZAMBIQUE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	RWANDA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SEYCHELLES	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SOMALIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	SWAZILAND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	UGANDA	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	32
	TANZANIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3	16	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
	ZAMBIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	ZIMBABWE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
REGION TOTAL		14	0	0	0	2	0	5	18	0	3	11	62	34	0	12	0	0	2	1	2	0	166
LARO																							
	ARGENTINA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	16
	BARBADOS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	BELIZE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	BOLIVIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
	BRAZIL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	12



TABLE 5A: TYPE OF AWARD BY REGION AND COUNTRY

4

Questions Answered: How does the type of award vary by the country of origin of the award holder? How are categories of awards spread across regions?  
Data as of MON, APRIL 21, 1986

REGION	COUNTRY	DISP	IN	INTERN	LDC	MANA	PDCA	PDDC	PF	PHDCA	PHDDC	POST	PRA	PRE	RAACA	RAADC	RF	SCIE	SF	SN	SRA	TRAV	TOTAL
	TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
	URUGUAY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	7
	VENEZUELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
REGION TOTAL		2	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	1	3	56	75	40	2	38	1	0	7	1	5	0	255
MERO	ALGERIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	EGYPT	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	1	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	23
	IRAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	JORDAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
	LEBANON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	7
	MOROCCO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	PAKISTAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
	SUDAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
	SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	TUNISIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	TURKEY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
REGION TOTAL		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	0	2	6	6	3	0	24	0	0	2	0	2	0	55

Data as of MON, APRIL 21, 1986

[illegible]

TABLE 5A: TYPE OF AWARD BY REGION AND COUNTRY

6

Questions Answered: How does the type of award vary by the country of origin of the award holder? How are categories of awards spread across regions?  
Data as of MON, APRIL 21, 1986

REGION	COUNTRY	DISP	IN	INTERN	LDC	MANA	PDCA	PDDC	PF	PHDCA	PHDDC	POST	PRA	PRE	RAACA	RAADC	RF	SCIE	SF	SN	SRA	TRAV	TOTAL
	IVORY COAST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	LIBERIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	MALI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	MAURITANIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	NIGERIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	4	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	18
	SENEGAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	22
	SIERRA LEONE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	TOGO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	ZAIRE	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
REGION TOTAL		0	4	0	1	0	0	2	11	1	6	18	28	18	1	22	0	0	0	2	1	0	115
GRAND TOTAL		16	7	0	1	4	0	13	85	2	19	155	345	143	4	146	3	0	17	9	13	0	985





[illegible]

TABLE 5B: TYPE OF AWARD BY DIVISION AND PROGRAM UNIT

3

Questions Answered: How does the type of award vary by areas of IDRC interest, represented by IDRC divisions and program units? To what extent have the program units in IDRC used FAD awards?  
Data as of THURS, APRIL 24, 1986

DIVISION	PROGRAM UNIT	DISP	IN	INTERN	LDC	MANA	PDCA	PDDC	PF	PHDCA	PHDDC	POST	PRA	PRE	RAACA	RAADC	RF	SCIE	SF	SN	SRA	TRAV	TOTA
SS	ADM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	AGE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	ECO	2	0	0	1	0	5	5	13	15	5	29	30	15	14	31	2	0	12	0	7	3	195
	EDU	0	1	0	0	0	7	0	5	12	5	42	40	22	14	22	1	0	1	8	0	3	186
	FIS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	IFD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	OEI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	POP	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	13	14	9	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	54
	STEP	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	2	0	8	10	6	4	9	1	0	1	0	3	0	58
	UND	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	14
	URB	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	1	6	5	0	7	10	0	0	2	0	1	2	41
DIVISION TOTAL		4	5	0	2	0	21	8	28	31	12	98	108	55	44	76	4	0	19	8	11	9	559

TABLE 5B: TYPE OF AWARD BY DIVISION AND PROGRAM UNIT

4

Questions Answered: How does the type of award vary by areas of IDRC interest, represented by IDRC divisions and program units? To what extent have the program units in IDRC used FAD awards?  
Data as of THURS, APRIL 24, 1986

DIVISION	PROGRAM UNIT	DISP	IN	INTERN	LDC	MANA	PDCA	PDDC	PF	PHDCA	PHDDC	POST	PRA	PRE	RAACA	RAADC	RF	SCIE	SF	SN	SRA	TRAV	TOTAL
UNDEFINED		4	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	21
GRAND TOTAL		17	7	0	2	4	39	13	86	42	19	196	366	175	79	147	6	2	26	9	14	16	1338

\*\*\*\*\*  
**TABLE 5C: AWARD CATEGORY BY LEVEL OF TRAINING**  
 \*\*\*\*\*

1

Questions Answered: At what level of training are IDRC awards granted?  
 How does this vary by the type of award?  
 Data as of THURS, MARCH 13, 1986

AWARD	BACHELORS	MASTERS	DOCTORATE	NON-DEGREE	TOTAL
DISP	0	0	0	16	16
IN	0	2	1	2	5
INTE	0	0	0	2	2
LDC	0	0	0	1	1
MANA	0	0	0	4	4
PDCA	0	3	0	35	38
PDDC	0	1	1	11	13
PF	1	2	0	83	86
PHDC	0	0	42	0	42
PHDD	0	0	19	0	19
POST	1	56	40	63	160
PRA	1	64	35	250	350
PRE	2	38	12	93	145
RAAC	0	20	4	55	79
RAAD	0	11	2	134	147
RF	0	0	0	4	4
SCIE	0	0	0	2	2
SF	0	0	0	26	26
SN	0	0	0	9	9
SRA	0	0	0	14	14
TRAV	0	0	0	16	16
YCR	0	34	21	15	70
	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL	5	231	177	835	1248

\*\*\*\*\*  
TABLE 5D: TYPE OF AWARD BY FIELD OF STUDY 1  
\*\*\*\*\*

Questions Answered: How does the type of award vary by field of study? Do award categories concentrate on particular fields of study?  
Data as of TUES, APRIL 22, 1986

FIELD OF STUDY	DISP	IN	INTERN	LDC	MANA	PDCA	PDDC	PF	PHDCA	PHDDC	POST	PRA	PRE	RAACA	RAADC	RF	SCIE	SF	SN	SRA	TRAV	TOTA
ACCOUNTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
AGRICULTURE	3	0	0	0	2	4	2	16	11	4	21	47	27	12	30	0	1	6	0	3	2	196
ANTHROPOLOGY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12
ARCHITECTURE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
ARTS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
BIOLOGY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
BUSINESS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
CHEMISTRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
COMMUNICATIONS	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	3	10	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	26
COMPUTER STUDIES	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
DEMOGRAPHY	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	12	12	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	44
DEVELOPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
ECONOMICS	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	9	4	18	29	18	14	26	0	0	12	0	7	2	157

TABLE 5D: TYPE OF AWARD BY FIELD OF STUDY

2

Questions Answered: How does the type of award vary by field of study? Do award categories concentrate on particular fields of study?  
Data as of TUES, APRIL 22, 1986

FIELD OF STUDY	DISP	IN	INTERN	LDC	MANA	PDCA	PDDC	PF	PHDCA	PHDDC	POST	PRA	PRE	RAACA	RAADC	RF	SCIE	SF	SN	SRA	TRAV	TOTA
EDUCATION	0	1	0	0	0	7	0	5	6	5	42	37	16	9	12	1	0	1	8	0	1	154
ENERGY	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
ENGINEERING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
ENVIRONMENT	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
FISHERIES	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	8	60	23	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	2	110
FORESTRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	30	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
GEOGRAPHY	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	2	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
GEOLOGY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	10
HEALTH	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	25	0	1	17	19	17	16	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	156
INFORMATION SCIENCE	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	3	16	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
JOURNALISM	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	5	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	21
LANGUAGE STUDIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
LAW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6

TABLE 5D: TYPE OF AWARD BY FIELD OF STUDY

3

Questions Answered: How does the type of award vary by field of study? Do award categories concentrate on particular fields of study?  
Data as of TUES, APRIL 22, 1986

FIELD OF STUDY	DISP	IN	INTERN	LDC	MANA	PDCA	PDDC	PF	PHDCA	PHDDC	POST	PRA	PRE	RAACA	RAADC	RF	SCIE	SF	SN	SRA	TRAV	TOTAL
LIBRARY STUDIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	10	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
MANAGEMENT STUDIES	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
MEDICINE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
NUTRITION STUDIES	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
POLITICAL SCIENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	1	1	0	3	5	1	0	4	0	0	0	26
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	1	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
SCIENCE	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
SOCIOLOGY	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	7	6	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	34
STATISTICS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TECHNOLOGY POLICY	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	0	5	6	4	4	7	0	0	1	0	2	0	39
TRAVEL GRANT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
URBAN STUDIES	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	3	1	0	5	3	0	0	2	0	1	0	20
GRAND TOTAL	16	7	0	1	4	38	13	86	42	19	160	350	145	79	147	4	2	26	9	14	16	1248

**AWARD CATEGORY CODES****-----**

<b>DISP</b>	<b>Displaced Scholar</b>
<b>IN</b>	<b>In Project Award</b>
<b>INTERN</b>	<b>Centre Internship</b>
<b>LDC</b>	<b>LDC Trainee</b>
<b>MANA</b>	<b>Management Training Award</b>
<b>PDCA</b>	<b>Professional Development Award (Can)</b>
<b>PDDC</b>	<b>Professional Development Award (DC)</b>
<b>PF</b>	<b>Pearson Fellowship</b>
<b>PHDCA</b>	<b>Ph.D Thesis Award (Can)</b>
<b>PHDDC</b>	<b>Ph.D Thesis Award (DC)</b>
<b>POST</b>	<b>Post-Project Award</b>
<b>PRA</b>	<b>Programme Related Award</b>
<b>PRE</b>	<b>Pre-Project Award</b>
<b>RAACA</b>	<b>Research Associate Award (Can)</b>
<b>RAADC</b>	<b>Research Associate Award (DC)</b>
<b>RF</b>	<b>Research Fellowship</b>
<b>SCIE</b>	<b>Scientific Manuscripts Award</b>
<b>SF</b>	<b>Senior Fellowship</b>
<b>SN</b>	<b>South-North Research Award</b>
<b>SRA</b>	<b>Senior Research Associate</b>
<b>TRAV</b>	<b>Travel and Research Grant in International Development</b>
<b>YCR</b>	<b>Young Canadian Researchers' Award</b>



This is a PINS print out of all FAD projects giving the project number, title, and status.

An \* marks those projects for which FAD has prepared a Project Completion Report (PCR).

- 3-P-82-012600      Status: Completed  
DEMOGRAPHIC TRAINING WORKSHOP (CHINA)
- 3-P-82-016100      Status: Completed  
INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR SCIENCE
- 3-P-82-017000      Status: Completed  
LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT - GROUP TRAINING WORKSHOP (KASETSART,  
THAILAND)
- \* 3-P-82-021300      Status: Completed  
PROCESS IMPROVEMENT WORKSHOP (VANCOUVER)
- \* 3-P-82-021800      Status: Completed  
Bivalve Training Project II (Dalhousie)
- 3-P-82-024200      Status: Completed  
GROUP TRAINING COURSE ON URBANIZATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES -  
PHASE I
- \* 3-P-82-024400      Status: Completed  
GROUP TRAINING: QUALITATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
- \* 3-P-83-000600      Status: Completed  
WORKSHOP ON THE METHODOLOGY OF APPLIED RESEARCH IN THE HEALTH  
SCIENCES - LIBERIA
- 3-P-83-001200      Status: Active  
MEDICAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM - PHASE I
- 3-P-83-001600      Status: Completed  
GROUP TRAINING COURSE ON DEVELOPING RESEARCHERS FOR EDUCATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
- 3-P-83-005500      Status: Completed  
SECOND FORESTRY RESEARCH COURSE
- \* 3-P-83-007600      Status: Active  
ENERGY AWARDS - PHASE I
- \* 3-P-83-008001      Status: Completed  
SCHOOL MAPPING AND MICROPLANNING IN THE CARIBBEAN REGION

3-P-83-035100      Status: Active  
RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP: DR. RALPH MILLER

\* 3-P-83-035200      Status: Completed  
FELLOWSHIPS IN CURRICULUM PLANNING

3-P-83-101400      Status: Active  
YOUNG CANADIAN RESEARCHERS AWARDS

3-P-84-001200      Status: Active  
POSTGRADUATE TRAINING COURSE IN PRECAMBRIAN GEOLOGY

3-P-84-003500      Status: Active  
TRAINING COURSE: AGRO-INDUSTRY MANAGEMENT

3-P-84-003600      Status: Completed  
TRAINING COURSE ON SPECIALIZED INFORMATION CENTRES FOR INFORMATION  
ANALYSIS AND CONSOLIDATION

3-P-84-003700      Status: Active  
TRAINING COURSE: FOREST RESEARCH MANAGEMENT

3-P-84-005100      Status: Active  
Degree Training: Rice Farming Systems (Bhutan)

\* 3-P-84-009200      Status: Active  
Training Workshop: Qualitative Research in Education

3-P-84-010300      Status: Active  
Training Workshop: Quantitative Research in Education

3-P-84-010400      Status: Active  
Training Course: Animal Production Systems

3-P-84-012800      Status: Active  
Energy Awards - Phase II

+ 3-P-84-013800      Status: Active  
Training Seminar on Qualitative Research Methods in Education

3-P-85-000100      Status: Active  
Training: Technology Transfer and Adaptation

\* 3-P-85-000200      Status: Active  
Training: Fisheries Economics

\* 3-P-85-000500      Status: Active  
Training Course: Applied Agricultural Economic Analysis

3-P-85-002100      Status: Active  
The Hague Academy of International Law Scholarships

3-P-85-002600      Status: Active  
Epidemiology Training (China) - Phase III

3-P-85-004800      Status: Active  
Waste Management Training (Singapore)

3-P-85-005900      Status: Active  
Energy Awards - Phase III

3-P-85-006100      Status: Active  
Research Methods Focussing on Gender Issues

3-P-85-006600      Status: Active  
Training Course: Microcomputers for Research

3-P-85-006700      Status: Active  
Regional Training Course: Irrigation and Water Management in Rice Cultivation

3-P-85-007300      Status: Active  
Post-Graduate Program (CIRES)

3-P-85-007700      Status: Active  
Consortium Graduate School (Caribbean)

3-P-85-008900      Status: Active  
Training Course: Fish Reproduction

Mon, 10 March 1986

FAD Projects

8

3-P-85-100900      Status: Active  
Medical Exchange Program - Phase II

3-P-85-102100      Status: Active  
Young Canadian Researchers